

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 7-11 are currently pending. Independent claims 1 and 7 have been amended in accordance with the discussion during the personal interview conducted on March 3, 2009.

As an initial matter, Applicants wish to thank Examiner Borsetti for the courtesies extended during the personal interview. The Examiner explained that the above type of change to the claims would facilitate his reconsideration of the outstanding rejections, but whether the application was allowed or not would depend upon review of the actual language and the results of an updated prior art search. However, good progress was made in understanding the rejections and identifying fruitful areas for amendment to overcome the Examiner's stated concerns.

More specifically, the final Office Action of September 23, 2008 includes a rejection of claims 1, 4 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Nagai* (U.S. Patent No. 6, 636,587); a rejection of claim 2, 3, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over *Nagai* in view of *Kishinsky* (U.S. Patent No. 6,286,033); and a rejection of claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over *Nagai* in view of *Henderson* (U.S. Patent No. 6,647,109). Applicants continue to traverse these rejections for at least the reasons stated in the Reply and Amendment of December 23, 2008, incorporated herein by reference.

However, during the interview, in discussing the definitions of terms such as "job" and "actions," the Examiner identified that the content of paragraph [0038] of the published version of this application¹ seemed to the Examiner to provide a solid

¹ U.S. Published Application No. 2004/0092293

distinction between the present invention and the applied art, and in particular *Nagai*, whether alone or in combination with the other references. Specifically, paragraph [0038] states that since the CTI control functions are configured as a job unit, the basic telephone actions can be made in accordance with only one job unit without individually and repeatedly calling on the CTI control functions. Applicants agree that this distinction further and clearly separates the present invention from the applied art. While Applicants are not yet prepared to concede that the other distinctions drawn upon in the Reply and Amendment referenced above are not sufficient, because this clear distinction found in paragraph [0038] has been recognized by the Office, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 7 to recite these features in order to pass the application along to issuance.

Drawing Objection

It is noted that the Reply and Amendment of December 23, 2008 included amendments to Figures 1 and 2 by labeling these Figures "Conventional Art" in accordance with the Examiner's general suggestion. The advisory action that issued on January 14, 2009 did not make mention of these changes to the drawings, so they are re-presented herein. The changes are supported, for instance, by the specification at paragraphs [0006] through [0008], [0014] and [0015] of the published version of the present application and U.S. 2004/0092293. Explicit approval of these changes is respectfully requested.

Conclusion


In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in light of these claim changes and the content of the personal interview, and issuance of a notice of allowance. Should any residual issues exist or arise, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: March 16, 2009

By:


Charles F. Wieland III
Registration No. 33096

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620